arXiv:1406.4251v2 [math.LO] 22 Jun 2014

A SEMI-GOOD FRAME WITH AMALGAMATION AND TAMENESS IN λ^+

ADI JARDEN

Abstract. We introduce a connection between tameness and non-forking frames. We assume the existence of a semi-good non-forking λ-frame, (λ, λ^+)-tameness and amalgamation in λ^+ and present sufficient additional conditions for the existence of a good non-forking λ^+-frame.

Moreover, we improve results of [JrSi3] about independence and dimension.

1. Introduction

In [Sh:h].III Shelah presented an axiomization of a non-forking relation in the context of AECs. But this non-forking relation relates to models of a specific cardinality, λ, only. Shelah presented a way to extend a non-forking relation to models of cardinality $> \lambda$ and proved that several axioms preserved.

The extension, uniqueness and symmetry are the problematic axioms. But uniqueness for models of cardinality $> \lambda$ is actually tameness. It is known that we can derive extension from uniqueness in the smaller cardinalities. So our main challenge is to get symmetry. Some years ago, we conjectured that the symmetry holds too, but it is still an open question.

In [**?**], Boney presented a variant of tameness that is a sufficient condition for symmetry. Later, Sebastien proved a non-structure theorem assuming the failure of symmetry in a similar context. It should be checked, if we can apply the non-structure theorem of Sebastien.

Here, we present a new sufficient condition for symmetry: we show that a variant of the continuity property for independence (studied in [JrSi3]) is a sufficient condition and prove it under reasonable hypothesis.

In [Sh:h].III and [JrSh 875] we derive good λ^+-frames too. Let us compare the main results of those papers with the main result in the current paper. The advantages of the current paper are:

(1) We do not restrict our selves to the saturated models,
(2) we do not restrict the relation $\preceq$ to $\preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+}$ and
(3) we do not assume that $I(\lambda^{++}, K) < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$.

The disadvantages of the current paper are the following hypotheses:

(1) the amalgamation property in λ^+ and
(2) tameness.

2. Non-forking frames

In [Sh:h].III, Shelah introduced the notion of a good (non-forking) λ-frame. It is an axiomatization of non-forking. In Definition [JrSh 875, 2.1.3], good frames generalized to semi-good frames: the stability hypothesis is weakened. From now we assume:

Hypothesis 2.0.1. $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \preceq, \bigcup, S^{bs})$ is a semi-good non-forking frame.

Remark 2.0.2. By [**?**], without loss of generality, for each $M \in K_\lambda$ $S^{bs}(M) = S^{na}(M)$, namely, the basic types are the non-algebraic types.

2.1. **Non-forking with larger models.** We recall [JrSh 875, Definition 2.6.1], where we extend the non-forking relation to include models of cardinality greater than λ.

Definition 2.1.1. $\overset{\geq\lambda}{\bigcup}$ is the class of quadruples (M_0, a, M_1, M_2) such that:

1. $\lambda \leq ||M_i||$ for each $i < 3$.
2. $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_2$ and $a \in M_2 - M_1$.
3. For some model $N_0 \in K_\lambda$ with $N_0 \preceq M_0$ for each model $N \in K_\lambda$, $N_0 \bigcup \{a\} \subseteq N \preceq M_1 \Rightarrow \bigcup(N_0, a, N, M_2)$.

Definition 2.1.2. Let M_0, M_1 be models in $K_{\geq\lambda}$ with $M_0 \preceq M_1$ and $p \in S(M_1)$. We say that p does not fork over M_0, when for some triple $(M_1, M_2, a) \in p$ we have $\overset{\leq\lambda}{\bigcup}(M_0, a, M_1, M_2)$.

Remark 2.1.3. We can replace the quantification 'for some' (M_1, M_2, a) in Definition 2.1.2 by 'for each'.

Definition 2.1.4. Let $M \in K_{>\lambda}$, $p \in S(M)$. p is said to be *basic* when there is $N \in K_\lambda$ such that $N \preceq M$ and p does not fork over N. For every $M \in K_{>\lambda}$, $S^{bs}_{>\lambda}(M)$ is the set of basic types over M. Sometimes we write $S^{bs}_{\geq\lambda}(M)$, meaning $S^{bs}(M)$ or $S^{bs}_{>\lambda}(M)$ (the unique difference is the cardinality of M).

The following fact is an immediate consequence of [JrSh 875, Theorem 2.6.8].

Fact 2.1.5. *If $\mathfrak{s}^+$ satisfies basic stability, uniqueness, extension and symmetry then it is a good non-forking frame.*

From now on we add the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2.1.6. (1) The amalgamation property in λ^+ holds and
(2) $(K, \preceq)$ satisfies (λ, λ^+)-tameness.

Theorem 2.1.7. *Suppose Hypotheses 2.0.1 and 2.1.6. If $\mathfrak{s}^+$ satisfies symmetry then it is a good non-forking λ^+-frame.*

Proof. By Propositions 2.1.8, 2.1.9 and 2.1.10.

Proposition 2.1.8. $\mathfrak{s}^+$ *satisfies uniqueness.*

Proof. By uniqueness for $\mathfrak{s}$ and tameness. ⊣

Proposition 2.1.9. $\mathfrak{s}^+$ *satisfies extension.*

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that if M is a model of cardinality λ, N is a model of cardinality λ^+, $M \preceq N$ and $p \in S^{bs}(M)$ then there is a non-forking extension of p to a type over N. Take a filtration $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ of N with $M_0 = M$. Let N_0 be a model of cardinality λ such that $M_0 \preceq N_0$ and for some $a \in N_0 - M_0$ $tp(a, M_0, N_0) = p$. We choose by induction on $\alpha < \lambda^+$ a model N_α and an embedding $f_\alpha : M_\alpha \to N_\alpha$ such that:

(1) f_0 is the identity from M to N_0,
(2) if $\alpha = \beta + 1$ then $f_\beta \subseteq f_\alpha$ and $tp(a, f_\alpha[M_\alpha], N_\alpha)$ does not fork over $f_\beta[M_\beta]$ (it is possible by the extension property in $\mathfrak{s}$) and
(3) if α is a limit ordinal then $N_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} N_\alpha$ and $f_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} f_\beta$.

Note that if α is limit then by continuity in $\mathfrak{s}$, $tp(a, f_\alpha[M_\alpha], N_\alpha)$ does not fork over $f_\beta[M_\beta]$ for each $\beta < \alpha$.

Define $N_{\lambda^+} =: \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda^+} N_\alpha$ and $f =: \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda^+} f_\alpha$. Since $\bigcup$ is closed under isomorphisms, it is sufficient to prove that $tp(a, f[N], N_{\lambda^+})$ does not fork over M. Let M' be a model of cardinality λ with $M \preceq M' \preceq f[N]$. For some $\alpha < \lambda^+$, we have $M' \subseteq f[M_\alpha]$. But $tp(a, f[M_\alpha], f[N])$ does not fork over M. Now use monotonicity of non-forking. ⊣

Proposition 2.1.10. $\mathfrak{s}^+$ *satisfies basic stability.*

Proof. By basic stability in $\mathfrak{s}$ and tameness. ⊣

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.7 ⊣

3. Symmetry

Recall (from [JrSi3]):

Definition 3.0.11. The sequence $\langle a, b \rangle$ is independent in (M, N) means that $\{a, b\} \subseteq N - M$ and for some M_1, M_2, we have $M \preceq M_1 \preceq M_2$, $N \preceq M_2$, $a \in M_1$, $tp(a, M, M_1)$ is basic, and the type $tp(b, M_1, M_2)$ does not fork over M.

Using the independence teminology, we can reformulate symmetry as follows: for every M, N, a, b the sequence $\langle a, b \rangle$ is independent in (M, N) if and only if the sequence $\langle b, a \rangle$ is independent in (M, N).

In [JrSi3], independence is defined for sequences of infinite length too, but since it is not used in the current paper, the reader may ignore the following definition and replace β^* by 2 in Definition 3.0.13. Anyway, for future applications, we study the more general case.

Definition 3.0.12.

(a) $\langle M_\alpha, a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle^\frown \langle M_{\alpha^*} \rangle$ is said to be *independent* over M when:

(1) $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ.

(2) $M \preceq M_0$.
(3) For every $\alpha < \alpha^*$, $a_\alpha \in M_{\alpha+1} - M_\alpha$ and the type $tp(a_\alpha, M_\alpha, M_{\alpha+1})$ does not fork over M.

(b) $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ is said to be *independent* in (M, M_0, N) when $M \preceq M_0 \preceq N$, $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\} \subseteq N - M$ and for some increasing continuous sequence $\langle M_\alpha : 0 < \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ and a model N^+ the sequence $\langle M_\alpha, a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle^\frown \langle M_{\alpha^*} \rangle$ is independent over M, $N \preceq N^+$ and $M_{\alpha^*} \preceq N^+$.

Definition 3.0.13. *The λ^+-continuity of serial independence property* is the following property: Let $\beta^* < \lambda^+$, $M \in K_{\lambda^+}$, $M \preceq N \in K_{\lambda^+}$ and let $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a filtration of M. If $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \beta^* \rangle$ is independent in (M_α, N) for each $\alpha < \lambda^+$ then it is independent in (M_{λ^+}, N).

In the following proposition we can weaken the assumption, so that it will refer to sequences of length $\beta^* = 2$ only.

Proposition 3.0.14. *If the λ^+-continuity of serial independence property holds then symmetry holds. So $\mathfrak{s}^+$ is a good λ^+-frame.*

From now on, our goal is to prove the λ^+-continuity of serial independence property under sufficient conditions.

4. A Non-Forking Relation on Models

By Theorem 4.0.30, the λ^+-continuity of serial independence property holds if there is a 'non-forking' relation NF on models (a relation NF satisfying $\bigotimes_{NF}$, see Definition 4.0.15).

In [Sh:h].III, Shelah defined a non-forking relation NF on models, which is based on the non-forking relation $\bigcup$. In [JrSh 875], we presented an equivalent definition of NF, such that limit models are not mentioned. The new definition is easier to work with and can be applied even when stability in λ does not hold.

In Definition **??**, we list axioms for a relation NF and denote 'the relation NF satisfies the list of the axioms' by $\bigotimes_{NF}$. Fact **??**, we present sufficient conditions for the existence of a relation NF satisfying $\bigotimes_{NF}$ and respecting $\mathfrak{s}$.

In Definitions 4.0.19,**??** we present two relations, that are based on NF.

Lemma 4.0.24 and Proposition **??** are the key points to prove the λ^+-continuity of serial independence property.

Definition 4.0.15. Let $NF \subseteq {}^4K_\lambda$. $\bigotimes_{NF}$ means that the following hold:
(a) If $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ then for each $n \in \{1, 2\}$ $M_0 \leq M_n \leq M_3$ and $M_1 \cap M_2 = M_0$.
(b) Monotonicity: if $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$, $N_0 = M_0$ and for each $n < 3$ $N_n \leq M_n \wedge N_0 \leq N_n \leq N_3, (\exists N^*)[M_3 \leq N^* \wedge N_3 \leq N^*]$ then $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$.
(c) Extension: For every $N_0, N_1, N_2 \in K_\lambda$, if for each $l \in \{1, 2\}$ $N_0 \leq N_l$ and $N_1 \bigcap N_2 = N_0$, then for some $N_3 \in K_\lambda$, $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$.

(d) Weak Uniqueness: Suppose for $x = a, b$, $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3^x)$. Then there is a joint embedding of N^a, N^b *over* $N_1 \bigcup N_2$.
(e) Symmetry: For every $N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3 \in K_\lambda$, $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3) \Leftrightarrow NF(N_0, N_2, N_1, N_3)$.
(f) Long transitivity: For $x = a, b$, let $\langle M_{x,i} : i \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ. Suppose that for each $i < \alpha^*$, $NF(M_{a,i}, M_{a,i+1}, M_{b,i}, M_{b,i+1})$. Then $NF(M_{a,0}, M_{a,\alpha^*}, M_{b,0}, M_{b,\alpha^*})$.
(g) NF is closed under isomorphisms: if $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $f : M_3 \to N_3$ is an isomorphism then $NF(f[M_0], f[M_1], f[M_2], f[M_3])$.

Definition 4.0.16. Let NF be a relation such that $\bigotimes_{NF}$ holds. The relation NF *respects the frame* $\mathfrak{s}$ means that if $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$, $a \in M_1 - M_0$ and $tp(a, M_0, M_1)$ is basic then $tp(a, M_2, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0.

By Theorem [JrSh 875, 5.5.4] (and Definitions [JrSh 875, 5.2.1,5.2.6]):

Fact 4.0.17. *If the class of uniqueness triples satisfies the existence property then there is a (unique) relation* $NF \subseteq {}^4K_\lambda$ *satisfying* $\bigotimes_{NF}$ *and respecting the frame* $\mathfrak{s}$.

From now on we assume:

Hypothesis 4.0.18. (1) $\mathfrak{s}$ is a semi-good non-forking frame,
(2) there is a non-forking relation NF repecting $\mathfrak{s}$.

We define a notion for: a model of size λ is independent from a model of size λ^+ over a model of size λ in a model of size λ^+.

Definition 4.0.19. Define a 4-ary relation $\widehat{NF}$ on K by

$$\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$$

when the following hold:

(1) N_0, N_1 are of cardinality λ,
(2) M_0, M_1 are of cardinality λ^+,
(3) There are filtrations $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ of M_0, M_1 respectively, such that $NF(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1}, N_{1,\alpha+1})$ holds for every $\alpha < \lambda^+$.

Fact 4.0.20 (basic properties of $\widehat{NF}$)**.**

(a) Disjointness: If $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$ *then* $N_1 \bigcap M_0 = N_0$.
(b) Monotonicity: Suppose $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$, $N_0 \preceq N_1^* \preceq N_1$, $N_1^* \bigcup M_0 \subseteq M_1^* \preceq M_1$ *and* $M_1^* \in K_{\lambda^+}$. *Then* $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1^*, M_0, M_1^*)$.
(c) Extension: Suppose $n < 2 \Rightarrow N_n \in K_\lambda$, $M_0 \in K_{\lambda^+}$, $N_0 \preceq N_1$, $N_0 \preceq M_0$, $N_1 \bigcap M_0 = N_0$. *Then there is a model* M_1 *such that* $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$.
(d) Weak Uniqueness: If $n < 2 \Rightarrow \widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_{1,n})$, *then there are* M, f_0, f_1 *such that* f_n *is an embedding of* $M_{1,n}$ *into* M *over* $N_1 \bigcup M_0$.

(e) *Respecting the frame: Suppose* $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$ *and* $tp(a, N_0, M_0) \in S^{bs}(N_0)$. *Then* $tp(a, N_1, M_1)$ *does not fork over* N_0.

Now we define a relation $\preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+}$ on K_{λ^+}, that is based on the relation $\widehat{NF}$:

Definition 4.0.21. Suppose $M_0, M_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$, $M_0 \preceq M_1$. Then $M_0 \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} M_1$ means that $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$ for some $N_0, N_1 \in K_\lambda$.

Fact 4.0.22. $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+})$ *satisfies the following properties:*

(a) *Suppose* $M_0 \preceq M_1$, $n < 2 \Rightarrow M_n \in K_{\lambda^+}$. *For* $n < 2$, *let* $\langle N_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ *be a representation of* M_n. *Then* $M_0 \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} M_1$ *iff there is a club* $E \subseteq \lambda^+$ *such that* $(\varepsilon < \zeta \wedge \{\varepsilon, \zeta\} \subseteq E) \Rightarrow NF(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{0,\zeta}, N_{1,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\zeta})$.
(b) $\preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+}$ *is a partial order.*
(c) *If* $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_2$ *and* $M_0 \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} M_2$ *then* $M_0 \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} M_1$.
(d) $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+})$ *satisfies Axiom c of AEC in* λ^+, *i.e.: If* $\delta \in \lambda^{+2}$ *is a limit ordinal and* $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ *is a* $\preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+}$*-increasing continuous sequence, then* $M_0 \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} \bigcup \{M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$ *and obviously it is* $\in K_{\lambda^+}$.
(e) K_{λ^+} *has no* $\preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+}$*-maximal model.*

Remark 4.0.23. Let M_1, M_2 be models of cardinality λ^+ with $M_1 \preceq M_2$. Then $M_1 \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} M_2$ if and only if for every two filtrations $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ and $\langle M_{2,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ of M_1 and M_2 respectively, for some club E of λ^+ for every $\alpha \in E$ we have $\widehat{NF}(M_{1,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha}, M_1, M_2)$.

Proof. One direction holds by definition. We prove the hard direction. Suppose $M_1 \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} M_2$. Let $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ and $\langle M_{2,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be two filtrations of M_1 and M_2 respectively. By Fact 4.0.22(a), for some club E of λ^+, for every $\varepsilon, \zeta \in E$ if $\varepsilon < \zeta$ then $NF(M_{1,\varepsilon}, M_{1,\zeta}, M_{2,\varepsilon}, M_{2,\zeta})$. Let $\alpha \in E$. Then the filtrations $\langle M_{1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \in E - \alpha \rangle$ and $\langle M_{2,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \in E - \alpha \rangle$ wittness that $\widehat{NF}(M_{1,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha}, M_1, M_2)$. ⊣

Lemma 4.0.24. *For every two models* M, M^+ *of cardinality* λ^+*:*

$$M \preceq M^+ \Leftrightarrow M \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} M^+.$$

Proof. By Fact 4.0.22(c), it is sufficient to find a model $N \in K_{\lambda^+}$ such that $M \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} N$ and $M^+ \preceq N$.

Without loss of generality, $M \neq M^+$ (otherwise, $N =: M$ does). Let A be the class of pairs, (M_1, M_1^+) of models of cardinality λ^+ with $M_1 \preceq M_1^+$. Define a strict partial order, $<_A$ on A, by: $(M_1, M_1^+) <_A (M_2, M_2^+)$ when the following hold:

(1) $M_1 \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} M_2$,
(2) $M_1^+ \preceq M_2^+$,
(3) $M_2 \cap M_1^+ \neq M_1$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M_2 & \xrightarrow{id} & M_2^+ \\ {\scriptstyle \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+}}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle id} \\ M_1 & \xrightarrow{id} & M_1^+ \end{array}$$

It is sufficient to find a pair $(N, N^+) \in A$ such that $(M, M^+) <_A (N, N^+)$ and $N = N^+$, becuase it yields $M^+ \preceq N$. So by the following claim, it is sufficient to find a pair $(N, N^+) \in A$ such that $(M, M^+) <_A (N, N^+)$ and (N, N^+) is a $<_A$-maximal pair in A.

Claim 4.0.25. *Let $(N, N^+) \in A$. If (N, N^+) is $<_A$-maximal then $N = N^+$.*

Proof. Let (N, N^+) be a pair in A with $N \neq N^+$. We should prove that (N, N^+) is not $<_A$-maximal. By density of basic types (in λ^+), for some $a \in N^+ - N$ the type $tp(a, N, N^+)$ is basic. So there is $N^- \in K_\lambda$ such that $N^- \preceq N$ and $tp(a, N, N^+)$ does not fork over N^-. For some $N_1^- \in K_\lambda$ and some $b \in N_1^-$ we have $tp(b, N^-, N_1^-) = tp(a, N^-, N^+)$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} b \in N_1^- & \xrightarrow{f} & N_1 & \xrightarrow{g} & N_1^+ \\ {\scriptstyle id}\uparrow & & {\scriptstyle \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+}}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle id} \\ N^- & \xrightarrow{id} & N & \xrightarrow{id} & N^+ \ni a \end{array}$$

By Fact 4.0.20(c), for some amalgamation $(id \restriction N, f, N_1)$ of N_1^- and N over N^- we have $\widehat{NF}(N^-, N, f[N_1^-], N_1)$. Since the relation $\widehat{NF}$ respects $\mathfrak{s}$, $tp(f(b), N, N_1)$ does not fork over N^-. By uniqueness of non-forking (in λ^+), $tp(a, N, N^+) = tp(f(b), N, N_1)$. Therefore there is an amalgamation $(id \restriction N^+, g, N_1^+)$ of N^+ and N_1 over N with $g(f(b)) = a$. Now we have

$$(N, N^+) <_A (g[N_1], N_1^+)$$

(because $N^+ \preceq N_1^+$, $N \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} g[N_1]$ and $a \in g[N_1] \cap N^+ - N$). ⊣

Claim 4.0.26. *If $\langle (M_\alpha, M_\alpha^+) : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is a $<_A$-increasing continuous sequence of pairs in A then $(M_\alpha, M_\alpha^+) <_A (\bigcup_{\alpha<\delta} M_\alpha, \bigcup_{\alpha<\delta} M_\alpha^+)$ for each $\alpha < \delta$.*

Proof. By smoothness, $\bigcup_{\alpha<\delta} M_\alpha \preceq \bigcup_{\alpha<\delta} N_\alpha$. By [JrSh 875, Theorem complete...], $M_{\lambda^+} \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} \bigcup_{\alpha<\delta} M^\alpha$. By the definition of AEC, $M_{\lambda^+ +1} \preceq \bigcup_{\alpha<\delta} N_\alpha$. ⊣

Now we can complete the proof of the lemma, using Claim 4.0.25. For the sake of a contradiction, assume that there is no $<_A$-maximal pair. We choose by induction on $\alpha < \lambda^{++}$ a pair $(M_\alpha, M_\alpha^+) \in A$ such that for every $\alpha < \lambda^{++}$, $(M_\alpha, M_\alpha^+) <_A (M_{\alpha+1}, M_{\alpha+1}^+)$ and for every limit $\alpha < \lambda^{++}$, $M_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} M_\beta$ and $M_\alpha^+ = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} M_\beta^+$ (so by Claim 4.0.26, $(M_\beta, M_\beta^+) <_A (M_\alpha, M_\alpha^+)$ for each $\beta < \alpha$). Define $M_{\lambda^{++}} =: \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda^{++}} M_\alpha$. The sequences $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^{++} \rangle$ and

$\langle M_\alpha^+ \cap M_{\lambda^{++}} : \alpha < \lambda^{++} \rangle$ are filtrations of $M_{\lambda^{++}}$. So for some $\alpha < \lambda^{++}$ (actually, for a club of α's) we have $M_\alpha = M_\alpha^+ \cap M_{\lambda^{++}}$. So

$$M_\alpha \subseteq M_\alpha^+ \cap M_{\alpha+1} \subseteq M_\alpha^+ \cap M_{\lambda^{++}} = M_\alpha.$$

Therefore $M_\alpha^+ \cap M_{\alpha+1} = M_\alpha$, which is impossible, because $(M_\alpha, M_\alpha^+) <_A (M_{\alpha+1}, M_{\alpha+1}^+)$. This contradiction shows that there is a $<_A$-extension (N, N^+) of (M, M^+), such that (N, N^+) is $<_A$-maximal. So by Claim 4.0.25, $N = N^+$. So $M \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ and $M^+ \preceq N^+ = N$. Lemma 4.0.24 is proved. $\dashv$

Proposition 4.0.27. *Let α^*, β^* be two ordinals $\leq \lambda^+$ and let $\langle M_{a,\alpha} : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ and $\langle M_{b,\alpha} : \alpha < \beta^* \rangle$ be two increasing continuous sequence of models of cardinality λ such that $M_{a,0} = M_{b,0}$. Then there is a 'rectangle of models' $\{M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \alpha^*, \beta < \beta^*\}$ and a sequence $\{f_\beta : \beta < \beta^*\}$ such that for every $\alpha < \alpha^*$ and $\beta < \beta^*$ the following hold:*

1. *$M_{\alpha,\beta} \in K_\lambda$,*
2. *if $\alpha + 1 < \alpha^*$ then $M_{\alpha,\beta} \preceq M_{\alpha+1,\beta}$,*
3. *if $\beta + 1 < \beta^*$ then $M_{\alpha,\beta} \preceq M_{\alpha,\beta+1}$,*
4. *if α is a limit ordinal then $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \bigcup_{\alpha'<\alpha} M_{\alpha',\beta}$,*
5. *if β is a limit ordinal then $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \bigcup_{\beta'<\beta} M_{\alpha,\beta'}$,*
6. *f_β is an isomorphism of $M_{b,\beta}$ onto $M_{0,\beta}$,*
7. *if $\beta = 0$ then $M_{\alpha,\beta} = M_{a,\alpha}$ and f_β is the identity on $M_{a,0} = M_{b,0}$,*
8. *$f_{\beta'} \subseteq f_\beta$ for every $\beta' < \beta$,*
9. *if β is a limit ordinal then $f_\beta = \bigcup_{\beta'<\beta} f_{\beta'}$,*
10. *$NF(M_{\alpha,\beta}, M_{\alpha,\beta+1}, M_{\alpha+1,\beta}, M_{\alpha+1,\beta+1})$, unless $\alpha+1 = \alpha^*$ or $\beta+1 = \beta^*$.*



Proof. We $\{M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \alpha^*\}$ and f_β by induction on β.

Case a: $\beta = 0$. In this case, see Clause (7).

Case b: β is a limit ordinal. In this case, by Clause (5), we must choose $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \bigcup_{\beta'<\beta} M_{\alpha,\beta'}$ and by Clause (9), we must choose $f_\beta = \bigcup_{\beta'<\beta} f_{\beta'}$. Fix

$\alpha < \alpha^*$. By Clauses (3) and (5) of the induction hypothesis, the sequences $\langle M_{\alpha,\beta'} : \beta' < \beta\rangle$ and $\langle M_{\alpha+1,\beta'} : \beta' < \beta\rangle$ are increasing and continuous. So by smoothness $M_{\alpha,\beta} \preceq M_{\alpha+1,\beta}$. Similarly, $f_\beta[M^b_\beta] \preceq M_{0,\beta}$. It remains to show that if α is limit then $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \bigcup_{\alpha'<\alpha} M_{\alpha',\beta}$. On one hand, if $x \in M_{\alpha',\beta}$ for some $\alpha' < \alpha$ then by the induction hypothesis, $x \in M_{\alpha',\beta'}$ for some $\beta' < \beta$. But $M_{\alpha',\beta'} \subseteq M_{\alpha,\beta'} \subseteq M_{\alpha,\beta}$. On the other hand, if $x \in M_{\alpha,\beta}$ then $x \in M_{\alpha,\beta'}$ for some $\beta' < \beta$. Therefore $x \in M_{\alpha',\beta'}$ for some $\alpha' < \alpha$. But $M_{\alpha',\beta'} \subseteq M_{\alpha',\beta}$ compelte...

Case c: $\beta = \gamma + 1$. complete... ⊣

Proposition 4.0.28. *If the sequence $\langle N_\alpha, a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\rangle^\frown\langle N_{\alpha^*}\rangle$ is independent over N_0 and $N_0 \preceq N^*_0 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ then for some $N^*_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ and some embedding $f : N^*_0 \to N^*_1$, the sequence $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\rangle$ is independent in $(f[N^*_0], N^*_1)$ and $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_{\alpha^*}, f[N^*_0], N^*_1)$.*

Proof. For every $\beta < \lambda^+$ and every $\alpha \leq \alpha^*$, we choose $N_{\alpha,\beta} \in K_\lambda$ and an embedding $f_{\alpha,\beta} : N_{\alpha,\beta} \to N_{\alpha,\beta+1}$ such that the following hold:

(1) if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \leq \alpha^*$ and $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2$ then complete...

⊣

Proposition 4.0.29. *Let $\alpha^* < \lambda^+$. If $\widehat{NF}(M^-_0, M^-_1, M_0, M_1)$ and $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\rangle$ is independent in (M^-_0, M^-_1) then it is independent in (M_0, M_1).*

Proof. The idea is to find an amalgam M_2 of M^-_1 and M_0 over M^-_0 such that $\widehat{NF}$ holds and the sequence is independent in (M_0, M_2). It is sufficient since the relation $\widehat{NF}$ satisfies weak uniqueness (by complete...).

We elavorate. By the definition of independence, there is an increasing continuous sequence $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha \leq \alpha^*\rangle$ of models of cardinality λ such that $N_0 = M^-_0$, $M^-_1 \preceq N_{\alpha^*}$ and the sequence $\langle M_\alpha, a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\rangle^\frown\langle M_{\alpha^*}\rangle$ is independent over M^-_0. By Proposition 4.0.28, for some $N^*_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ the sequence $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\rangle$ is independent in (M_0, N^*_1) and $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_{\alpha^*}, M_0, N^*_1)$.

But $\widehat{NF}(M^-_0, M^-_1, M_0, M_1)$. Therefore by the weak uniqueness of $\widehat{NF}$ (Fact **??**) complete...

complete... ⊣

Theorem 4.0.30. *The λ^+-continuity of serial independence property holds.*

Proof. Let $\beta^* < \lambda^+$, $M_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$, $M_1 \preceq M_2 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ and let $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$ be a filtration of M_1. Suppose $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \beta^*\rangle$ is independent in $(M_{1,\alpha}, M_2)$ for each $\alpha < \lambda^+$. We have to prove that $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \beta^*\rangle$ is independent in (M_1, M_2).

By Lemma 4.0.24, $M_1 \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} M_2$. Let $\langle M_{2,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$ be a filtration of M_2. By Remark 4.0.23, there is a club E of λ^+ such that for every $\alpha \in E$, $\widehat{NF}(M_{1,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha}, M_1, M_2)$. Define $J =: \{a_\beta : \beta < \beta^*\}$. $J \subseteq M_2$. Since $|J| < \lambda^+$, for some $\alpha \in E$ we have $J \subseteq M_{2,\alpha}$. But $\widehat{NF}(M_{1,\alpha}, N_{2,\alpha}, M_1, M_2)$. So by Proposition 4.0.29, $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \beta^*\rangle$ is independent in (M_1, M_2). ⊣

Proposition 4.0.31. *Suppose:*

(1) $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \bigcup)$ *is a semi-good* λ*-frame*
(2) $(K, \preceq)$ *satisfies the amalgamation property in* $[\lambda, \mu]$
(3) $(K, \preceq)$ *satisfies* (λ, μ)*-tameness*
(4) $\mathfrak{s}$ *satisfies the continuity of serial independence property.*

Then $\mathfrak{s}^{\mu}$ *satisfies symmetry.*

Proof. Suppose N_0, N_1, N_2 are models of cardinality μ, $N_0 \preceq N_1 \preceq N_2$, the type $tp(a, N_0, N_1)$ is basic and $tp(b, N_1, N_2)$ does not fork over N_0. Let $\langle M_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle M_{2,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be filtrations of N_0, N_1, N_2 respectively such that $M_{0,\alpha} \preceq M_{1,\alpha} \preceq M_{2,\alpha}$ for each $\alpha < \lambda^+$. Without loss of generality, the types $tp(a, N_0, N_1)$, $tp(b, N_0, N_2)$ do not fork over $M_{0,0}$, $a \in M_{1,0}$ and $b \in M_{2,0}$.

The sequence $\langle a, b \rangle$ is independent in $(M_{0,0}, M_{0,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha})$ for each $\alpha < \lambda^+$. So by symmetry in $\mathfrak{s}$, the sequence $\langle b, a \rangle$ is independent in $(M_{0,0}, M_{0,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha})$ for each $\alpha < \lambda^+$. By Theorem 4.0.30 (the λ^+-continuity of serial independence property), $\langle b, a \rangle$ is independent in (N_0, N_2). ⊣

Corollary 4.0.32. *Suppose:*

(1) $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \bigcup)$ *is a semi-good* λ*-frame*
(2) $(K, \preceq)$ *satisfies the amalgamation property in* $[\lambda, \mu]$
(3) $(K, \preceq)$ *satisfies* (λ, λ^+)*-tameness*
(4) $\mathfrak{s}$ *satisfies the continuity of serial independence property.*

Then $\mathfrak{s}^+$ *is a good* λ^+*-frame.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.0.31 and Theorem 2.1.7. ⊣

Proof. By 4.0.31, symmetry holds. complete... ⊣

In complete... we generalize the following corollary, eliminating the tameness assumption:

Corollary 4.0.33. *Suppose:*

(1) $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \bigcup)$ *is a semi-good* λ*-frame*
(2) $(K, \preceq)$ *satisfies the amalgamation property in* $[\lambda, \mu]$
(3) $(K, \preceq)$ *satisfies* (λ, μ)*-tameness*
(4) the class of uniqueness triples satisfies the existence property.

Then $\mathfrak{s}^{\mu}$ *is a good* λ*-frame.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.0.30 and Corollary 4.0.32 ⊣

5. Combining Uniqueness Triples with the Amalgamation Property in λ^+

Theorem 5.0.34. *If*

(1) the class of uniqueness triples satisfies the existence property,
(2) the amalgamation property in λ^+ *holds.*

The $\mathfrak{s}^+$ *is a good non-forking* λ^+*-frame.*

We give two proofs. The first one is similar to the proof Corollary **??**, using a replacement of (λ, λ^+)-tameness.

Proof. By complete... it is sufficient to prove uniqueness. ⊣

Now we give a second proof, using results from [JrSh 875]:

Proof. By [JrSh 875, complete...], it is sufficient to prove that the relation $\preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+}$ satisfies smoothness. But by Lemma 4.0.24, the relation $\preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+}$ is equivalent to $\preceq \restriction K_{\lambda^+}$, so by the definition of AEC, it satisfies smoothness. ⊣

6. Solving the Goodness$^+$ Question

Some years ago Shelah asked whether for every successful good λ-frame,

$$M_1 \preceq M_2 \Leftrightarrow M_1 \preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+} M_2$$

holds for every two models M_1, M_2 which are saturated in λ^+ over λ.

In [Sh:h].last,complete... he proved it under the assumption that there are no many models of cardinality complete.. Here we solve this open question:

Corollary 6.0.35. *complete...*

Proof. Since we restrict ourselves to the saturated models in λ^+ over λ, we have categoricity in λ^+. But we assume $I(\lambda^{++}, K) < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$. Hence, by Fact **??**, we have amalgamation in λ^+. So by Lemma 4.0.24, the relations $\preceq \restriction K_{\lambda^+}$ and $\preceq^{NF}_{\lambda^+}$ are equivalent. ⊣

7. Dimenstion

In [JrSi3] we proved that if the continuity property holds then the dimension is well-behaved. First note that the continuity property in [JrSi3] relates to independence of sets, while the continuity property here relates to serial independence. In this sense, we study here a stronger continuity property.

While in [JrSi3], we study $\mathfrak{s}$ (relating to models of cardinality λ), here we study $\mathfrak{s}^+$. While in [JrSi3], we assume that the class of uniqueness triples (in λ) satisfies the existence property, we do not assume the same for λ^+ (but assume the same assumption). This cause a difficulty.

But by the λ^+-continuity of serial independence property, we can prove that the dimension is semi-well-behaved in the following sense:

Theorem 7.0.36. *Suppose: complete..., and the class of uniqueness triples in λ satisfies the existence property. Let M, N be models of cardinality λ^+ with $M \preceq N$ and let J_1, J_2 be two maximal independent sets in (M, N). Then one of the following hold:*

(1) J_1, J_2 are finite sets,
(2) $|J_1| + |J_2| = \lambda^+$ or
(3) $|J_1| = |J_2|$.

Proof. complete... ⊣

References

[Bo] Boney, Will. Tameness and Extending Frames. preprint available at `arXiv preprint arXiv:1308.6006` (2013).

[BoGr] Boney, Will, and Rami Grossberg. Forking in short and tame AECs. prepritnavailable at `arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.6562` (2013).

[BoGrKo] Boney, Will, Rami Grossberg and Alecsei Koleshnikov. Canonical forking in AECs. preprint available at `arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.1494` (2014).

[Gr] Rami Grossberg. Classification of Abstract Elementary Classes. A book in preparation.

[Gr 21] Rami Grossberg. Classification theory for abstract elementary classes. Logic and Algebra, ed. Yi Zhang, Contemporary Mathematics 302 (2002), 165–204.

[GrVa 24] Rami Grossberg and Monice VanDieren. Shelah's Categoricity Conjecture from a successor for Tame Abstract Elementary Classes. Journal of Symbolic Logic, Vol 71 (2006) 2, 553–568.

[JrSh 875] Adi Jarden and Saharon Shelah. Good frames with a weak stability. Published at A.P.A.L. Available at `http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168007212001558`.

[JrSi3] Adi Jarden and Alon Sitton. Independence of Sets Without Stability. Submitted at Symbolic Logic.

[JrSh 940] Adi Jarden and Saharon Shelah. Weakening the local character. Work in progress.

[JrSh 966] Adi Jarden and Saharon Shelah. Existence of uniqueness triples without stability. Work in progress.

[Sh:h] Saharon Shelah. Classification Theory for Abstract Elementary Classes. Studies in Logic. College Publications. www.collegepublications.co.uk, 2009. Binds together papers 88r,300,600,705,838 with introduction E53.

[Sh E46] Saharon Shelah. Categoricity of an abstract elementary class in two successive cardinals. Preprint available at `http://shelah.logic.at/liste.html`

E-mail address, Adi Jarden: `jardenadi@gmail.com`

Department of Computer Science and Mathematics, Ariel University Center of Samaria, Ariel, Israel

Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel